

REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant asserts that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful.

Status of Claims

Claims 18-27, 29 and 31-34 are pending in the application. Claims 18-29 and 31-34 have been rejected. Claim 28 has been cancelled. Claims 18 and 31 have been amended.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

The Telephone Interview

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner, Robert Popovics, for granting and attending the telephone interview on May 25, 2005 with Applicant, Applicant's Representatives, Guy Yonay, attorney of record for Applicant, and Joel Stein, Esq. Prior art discussed in the interview included generally the art cited by the Examiner as was attached to the Office Action mailed July 13, 2004.

In the interview, Applicant and Applicant's representatives discussed proposed amendments to the claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections. More specifically, the Examiner's rejections of independent claims 18 and 31 were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments raised new issues, and further indicated that the mere changing of a valve absent a showing of unexpected results specifically associated therewith would not constitute a patentable distinction. The Examiner urged a thorough review of the prior art cited in the July 13, 2004 Office Action. No specific agreement was reached regarding the rejections or the allowability of the pending claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

*Interview
Record
O.K.
RSP
8/4/05*